

rather than desert an Administration which governs Ireland in the interests of Ulster.

So in spite of its many grave and obvious defects, Mr. Goschen may succeed in carrying his plan through Parliament. But what a victory it will be that in such an event will fall to his lot! Parliament may be docile; even the bishops may forget their scruples, and copy the example of Mr. T. W. Russell by going into the lobby on behalf of the publicans. But what will the country think of it all? If there is one question upon which the majority of Englishmen are more clearly of one way of thinking than upon any other, it is on this question of compensation. Even those who are by no means fanatical advocates of temperance, those who themselves may support in a small way the institution of the public-house, are almost to a man resolved that no public money, no money extracted from the pockets of the rate-payers or tax-payers, no matter under what form of impost, shall be paid to the publican to compensate him for the loss of a business which, as it is, he carries on to his own enrichment at the cost of the community as a whole. There are thousands of Englishmen who feel so strongly on this point that they would resist the attempt to enforce a tax for such a purpose with the heroic pertinacity with which the Quakers in former days resisted the payment of Church rates. "Ulster will fight, and Ulster will be right," remarked a certain statesman once, and his observation was applauded by the whole Unionist party. There are some teetotallers who, we verily believe, would fight rather than pay to compensate those whose very existence they look upon as a national curse; and we are inclined to think they would fight in a much better cause than that on behalf of which Ulster was supposed to be ready to take up arms.

Of course these are the extreme men, the "fanatics," upon whose extravagance and unreasonableness of sentiment superior persons, like Mr. Goschen, delight to pour scorn and contempt. But where is the wisdom of a policy which needlessly provokes the hostility of these enthusiasts—men to whom the crusade against the trade in strong drink is as a sacred thing? And behind these men there is the nation at large, with its honest detestation of drunkenness, its sad consciousness of the fact that Great Britain would be infinitely richer, happier, more prosperous, and more powerful than she is, if it were not for that terrible evil which has its root in the drink traffic. What will the nation have to say, when it is next consulted, of the conduct of the Government which, by means of a side-wind, succeeded in obtaining Parliamentary recognition for that hateful principle, the compensation of the publican? Is it likely that the "hard case" of the dispossessed publican will move the elector, who knows that his money is about to be extracted from his pocket to solace that worthy but unappreciated person for the loss of the opportunity of growing rich at the expense of his neighbours? We need hardly point out that the case of the publican is not quite the same in reality as it is in appearance. In how many cases is he at this moment the free man he professes to be, and not merely the vassal of some wealthy brewer? In how many cases is he now liable to lose his position at a moment's notice, without the remotest chance of securing even a penny in the shape of compensation? It will be very necessary to answer these questions before we can arrive at a just conclusion as to the extent of the claim which the publican has upon the consideration of his fellow-countrymen.

Ministers have done the wrong thing, and they have done it in the wrong way. Professing a great desire to advance the temperance cause, they have taken a step which must increase a thousandfold the difficulties which have hitherto interfered with the success of any effective reform of the liquor traffic. Instead of being the friends of the community at large, they have raised their flag as the friends of the publican. They will have their reward, doubtless. Once again, at the next General Election, every tap-room in Great Britain will be a free Conser-

vative Committee Room. But against this dubious advantage will have to be set the fact that the sentiment of the nation as a whole will have been outraged by the action of the Government, and that every real temperance reformer will know that he has in Mr. Goschen and his colleagues open enemies of that movement which seeks to eradicate one of the worst of our social plague spots. But the debate of the past week, immensely damaging as it has been to the Ministry, must certainly bear good fruit ere long. It has reawakened the interest even of Parliament in the question of the drink traffic; it has stimulated the enthusiasm of the reformers, and it has touched the conscience of the public. We shall be very much surprised if, side by side with the great and paramount issues dealing with Ireland upon which the nation will, ere long, be asked to pronounce, we do not find a well-considered scheme for the reform of the licensing system laid before the country for its adoption. Popular approval of such a scheme will mean the absolute condemnation of the men who are responsible for the vexatious and mischievous proposals which the House of Commons has this week been discussing.

### THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SWEATING.

IT is not perhaps very flattering to the Lords' Committee on Sweating to say that the report they have at last issued is about as good as was expected. It is at least gratifying to the public, if unfortunate for the Committee, that the lapse of time since they began their laborious task has rendered much of the evidence obsolete before the conclusions based upon it have appeared. The two past years have been momentous years in the history of unskilled labour in East London, and no one will regret that, in the words of the report, "the conditions of dock labour have so materially altered that we think any summary of the evidence we could give would be calculated to mislead;" or that the changes effected by the still more recent strike among the East London boot-makers go far to destroy the value of the published evidence on one of the principal trades investigated.

The report begins with a short summary of the four volumes of evidence relating to the various "sweated trades," which, though somewhat ill-digested and deficient in sense of proportion, will probably be useful to the casual reader; and it concludes with three or four pages of recommendations, which are equally wanting, so far as we can see, in brilliant suggestion and serious error. That is, if we omit the cardinal error of the whole inquiry, which in the pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of an imaginary "system" of employment, has necessarily taken the form of a piecemeal examination of the conditions of certain departments of certain trades, ignoring their essential relations with other parts of the industrial organisation of the country.

For this faulty method the Lords' Committee are not entirely responsible. It is not their fault that popular imagination has fixed on a particular method of labour organisation, carried out by an imaginary human monster as the direct cause of the economic evils which afflict many industries in East London and elsewhere. The public do not readily discriminate between contract and sub-contract, and the terms sweater, sub-contractor, and middleman are habitually used by them as convertible terms. Even Mr. Burnett's report to the Board of Trade in 1887, which led to the present inquiry, was not altogether free from the popular confusion of thought, and the evils of sweating were constantly referred to the action of a peculiar and definite system of employment. The idea is very natural. In many trades it is proved up to the hilt that an acute form of competition exists, under which many workers toil for almost incredible hours in return for the barest subsistence wage. These trades are mostly carried on on a small scale, and often under the system of self-contract. When once the common name "sweating" has been found for

these abuses, it is but a step to describe them as caused by the "sweating system." Yet to do this is to look at the phenomena from a false point of view, and one of the most satisfactory features in the present report is the final abandonment by the Committee of all attempt either to discover a system co-extensive with the evils they have been investigating, or even to define the object of their inquiries. For as the evidence proceeded, the same evils were revealed in trades in which the middleman is absent as in those in which he is present; in industries in which no foreigners are employed, as in those flooded by foreign immigration.

Making then no attempt to define the method by which the evils called "sweating" are produced, the report treats merely of the observed results, which are shortly described as an inadequate wage, excessive hours, and insanitary conditions. In other words, the whole inquiry is found to resolve itself into an investigation of the conditions of certain poorly paid trades.

It is when this conclusion is reached (and its soundness cannot be disputed) that we fully realise how profoundly unsatisfactory the whole inquiry has been; for the evils of hard work and low pay are not confined to a few special industries conducted on a small scale, nor yet to industries in great towns—note for example the state of agricultural wages in the South of England. And moreover it becomes clear that from the point of view now adopted, no inquiry could be complete which does not fully take into account the relation of London industry to that of the provinces. It is not enough that the Committee have been forced to widen their reference, and to inquire into the abuses prevailing in "certain" industries in a few provincial districts; for it is the competition of provincial factory production on a large scale, with London production on a small scale, that is the central feature in the situation. Early in the inquiry the Committee were urged by a witness possessing unsurpassed knowledge of the methods of industrial inquiry, to ascertain more precisely the relation of London and provincial production in the chief "sweated" industries. The advice appears to have been disregarded, and scarcely a word about provincial competition appears in the final report.

The real economic situation appears to be this: there are certain industries, such as the making of ready-made boots and clothing, which can be most economically carried on in large factories with the aid of elaborate machinery. Owing to their cheapness these machine-made goods have gradually encroached on the market of the old hand-made articles, and a very large factory industry has consequently grown up in many parts of the country. Thus Leeds is the centre of a large manufacture of slop clothing, while a great trade in machine-made boots has sprung up in Leicester, Northampton, and elsewhere. With these vigorous manufacturing centres London has hitherto proved unable to compete on their own terms. Factory industry does not flourish in the East End, partly owing to high rents, partly to distance from the great centres of coal supply, partly, perhaps, to the difference in temperament and power of sustained and regular work between cockney and provincial.

But the presence in the metropolis of a stagnant population of inefficient and helpless workers has provided another mode of competition which has proved more successful. Where the factory has failed the small workshop has succeeded in holding its own; but for its success it has been necessary for the lowest class of labour to be employed, in the graphic words of one of the witnesses, "all the hours that God sends," and to take a wage which the Committee describe as "barely sufficient to maintain existence."

When these essential facts are grasped, all the others fall into their proper places. It is clear that while the possibility of sweating depends, as the report affirms, on the presence of a helpless population, it is quite unnecessary to suppose the existence of the monster sweater of *Punch* gorging himself on the fruits of the labour of his unfortunate "sweatees."

Often the middleman is altogether absent; often the master earns no more than the employed. It is, in fact, the well-known preference of the Jew for an income derived from profit over an equal income derived from wage that is one of the chief sources of that remarkable tendency in East London to the multiplication of small employers, which is the conspicuous feature of sweating. Any one can become a small master, and the immigration which has recently taken place of foreign Jews has supplied the sweater with a continual stream of labourers starting with an indefinitely low standard of life. Not indeed that the foreign Jew is willing, as is popularly supposed, to work permanently all round the clock for starvation wage, for there is no class whose individual members more inevitably move upwards. Patient, adroit, persistent, with a standard of comfort far more elastic than that of the Gentile, the Jew will work maybe for nothing while learning his trade, but will rarely lose a chance of bettering himself when it offers. The situation is summed up in the remark of a witness, "The Gentile saves to drink, the Jew to save." The contribution therefore of foreign immigration to the evils of sweating depends entirely on the continual arrival of fresh sets of immigrants, and even so its importance is easily exaggerated, for as the Committee point out, many of the worst cases of sweating occur in trades in which there is no foreign immigration at all. The further consideration of the Report must, however, for the present be deferred.

#### THE LIBERAL VOTE AND THE INDIA BILL.

THE Liberal Party has now to resolve on its attitude towards Lord Cross's India Bill. That Bill is the outcome of an agitation which has been going on in India during the past five years. The Indian National Congress, although holding the most conspicuous place in the movement, was really the authoritative expression of a general conviction among the educated classes that the old Councils Act of 1861 had ceased to be in accord with the modern requirements of India. The Congress, in spite of much foolish misrepresentation as to its composition and aims, gradually won the respect of moderate men of many shades of opinion by its temperate proposals and the strictly constitutional character of its methods. After some hesitation, parts of its programme have been accepted even by such strongly Anglo-Indian bodies as the Indian Chambers of Commerce, and its most successful president was a leading British merchant, who had filled the highest offices among the European community in Calcutta. During its five years' work there have been, as there must inevitably have been, errors of judgment by individual members. But its corporate action, and its resolutions as a body, reflect credit alike upon the political capacity and the practical training of the delegates, now approaching two thousand, who compose the Congress, and with whom the voting power rests. It will be presently seen that we differ materially from some of its most recent conclusions. But this difference ought not to obscure the fact that the Indian National Congress had well earned the influence which it has now exercised upon Lord Cross's measure.

The Congress clearly discerned from the outset that the key to the situation was a reform in the Legislative Councils of the Viceroy and of the Provincial Governors. Some of its requests, indeed, were so reasonable and moderate that, now that they are embodied in a Government Bill, it is difficult to understand why five years' agitation should have been required to procure their official acceptance. On the three points: that the national Revenue and Expenditure of India should be annually laid before the Governor-General's Legislative Council; the right of asking questions under certain restrictions in the Legislative Councils; and, thirdly, a



numerical increase of the members of the Councils—there will be no serious difference of opinion in the House of Commons; although, as Lord Cross's Bill now gives effect to the first two, Liberal members and fair-minded Conservatives will probably desire to see the third of them dealt with in a more satisfactory manner than provided for in the Bill as it stands at present.

It is in regard to the fourth point of the programme of the Congress—namely, the recognition of the principle of representation—that a conflict will take place. And it is on this point that the Liberal Party must now make up its mind. The matter will come before the House on Mr. Bradlaugh's amendment, regretting the absence of such a recognition in Lord Cross's Bill. During its first four years the Congress confined itself to general statements as to the necessity for a representative element in the Councils, and formulated its views only so far as to suggest the election of a certain proportion of representative members by means of the Municipalities, District Boards, Chambers of Commerce, and Universities. It referred vaguely to some possible alternative scheme of election, but the only formulated basis in its Resolutions was the one mentioned in the last sentence. It clearly recognised that, "whatever system be adopted, the details must be worked out separately for each Province." The more advanced party in the last Congress (December, 1889) produced, however, a new scheme of electoral constituencies to be manufactured on a uniform basis for all India. According to this new scheme India was to be divided into uniform electoral blocks, which (acting through intermediate electoral colleges) should send one representative to the Governor-General's Legislative Council for every five millions of the population, and one representative to the Legislative Council of the particular Province for each million of the population. The total number of members of the Governor-General's Council was to be increased to eighty, of whom one-half were to be thus elected. Provision was made for the representation of minorities and of special classes, and for the organisation of the intermediate electoral bodies, with whom the direct selection of the members of the Legislative Councils would rest.

This new scheme was the result of a compromise between three proposals at the last Congress, and it makes little pretension to finality. It has not won the assent of the most influential moderate members of the Indian Reform Party, either in India or England. Sir Madhava Rao, a pillar of strength to that party in India, has resigned his place in the standing committee of the Congress, and no attempt was made to defend the new scheme by Lord Ripon when Lord Cross's measure came before the House of Lords. Indeed, Lord Northbrook, whose name is associated with many progressive measures in connection with India, condemned it in unsparing terms. In India itself, the leading native journal on the Bombay side, *The Indian Spectator*, has declared against it. The most important native newspaper on the Bengal side, *The Hindu Patriot*, has warned the Indian orators who are now addressing meetings in various parts of England, that if the report of their speeches is correct, they are falling into exaggerations which do not represent enlightened opinion in India. Finally, a strong protest was lately made in *The Times* on behalf of the moderate Indian reformers, against any such artificial scheme of electoral bodies, manufactured wholesale and upon a single paper-pattern for all India.

It would be unwise for the Liberal Party in England to pledge itself to an extreme proposal which is thus condemned by the thoughtful and practically experienced members of the Indian Reform Party. The setting up of artificial uniformity for all India, by which the voting power would be concentrated in the hands of the Gangetic population, and the sudden conversion of the Legislative Council of the Viceroy from what is essentially a Council into a Legislative Assembly would involve serious risks, and such a scheme would, after a period of strain, if not of actual danger, inevitably end in a reaction against all progressive measures in India.

The Conservative Government has not been slow to detect the error into which the extreme party among the Indian reformers has fallen, and to take advantage of the temporary state of weakness which has resulted to the cause of Indian reform. But there is no difference whatever among the Indian Reform Party as to the necessity for representation in some form or other. This was felt even in the House of Lords, and the Earl of Northbrook's amendment, which to save further pressure was accepted by Lord Cross, furnished a basis for its more adequate recognition in the House of Commons. It is to procure this more adequate recognition that Mr. Bradlaugh will bring forward his amendment; and we sincerely hope that the Government may itself see its way to meet the amendment in an amicable spirit. For one main object of the Bill, namely, to set at rest the persistent agitation which has been going on in India during the past five years, will be defeated unless it deals with this matter. We have candidly stated the difference of opinion among Indian reformers as to the particular form of representation, in order that we may state with the greater force our conviction, that until Parliament gives some clear declaration as to the principle of representation, there will be no rest in India.

But in supporting Mr. Bradlaugh's amendment, the Liberal Party in England have a right to know what they are voting for. The steady proposal of the Indian Reform Party during the first four years of the Congress was to obtain a moderate number of representative members in the Councils, or to leave their selection to certain well-recognised public bodies in the various provinces. We do not think that Parliament should be asked to go further than this at present. We agree with Lord Northbrook that the details should be chiefly left to be worked out by the Indian Government in rules to be framed under the Act. Mr. Bradlaugh's amendment would have this effect, unless, in the speech by which he introduces it, he pushes his claims too far. It is in some respects unfortunate that he consented to embody in a draft Bill of his own the more extreme proposal put forward at the last Indian Congress. But that separate Bill is little likely to come seriously before Parliament—at any rate, during the present session. Mr. Bradlaugh should recognise the fact that it would be disastrous to the present prospects of Indian reform if men like Mr. Bryce, who have really studied the question, should feel themselves constrained to absent themselves, or to pass over for the moment to the other camp.

### ENGLAND IN AFRICA.

DURING the week two important personages have again drawn our attention to East Africa. In Germany, the Chancellor has unfolded his views of colonial policy to the Imperial Parliament. At home, Mr. Stanley has reproached us, in language to which we could at times demur, but with a force that permits of no demurrers, for heedlessly allowing our opportunities to drift by. The statement of the German Minister is firm and moderate. His watchword in Africa is steady progress forward. He seeks and welcomes our alliance. He relies on the cordial support of the German people, to whom the expansion of the Fatherland has become an ideal to-day, as its union was their ideal yesterday. He asks for a free hand to labour and to spend. Mr. Stanley is as firm but more exacting. He reminds us roughly that we have the power to act, and that it is our own fault if we rest idle. In Germany people may commit their interests to the Government, for on this point their Government is abreast, if not ahead, of public opinion. But in England the Government slumbers, and it is therefore all the more imperative for the governed to awake.

The signal service which Mr. Stanley has rendered to this country, and for which Englishmen to-day are paying him

honour, lies not in the rescue of a recalcitrant Bashaw, but in having taught us that in Eastern Africa the time for exploration is over and the time for settlement has come. So far as the destinies of nations can be foretold, it seems clear that Africa must fall into the grasp of European civilisation. Civilisation, we submit to Mr. Stanley, is sometimes a term of ambiguous import. Even "the bullet and the Bible" are not always the sure forerunners of the regeneration of mankind. But still, civilisation in Africa comes to deliver as well as to annex, and the question for us is what part in forwarding it we mean to play. Do we intend to relinquish the field to other occupants? Or has the colonising genius of this country already worn itself out? Looking at the map of Africa, it is difficult to believe that the opening up of the Dark Continent is a work in which Englishmen are to have no share. In the South, British dominion is steadily advancing; in the West, some of the most flourishing settlements are British; in the North-East, we occupy a country which we may promise, but rightly hesitate, to quit; in the centre our outposts, in spite of "anti-enterprise companies and namby-pamby journalism," move forwards every day. But, apart from our position in Africa, there are other reasons against abandoning the task. We have learned to believe that we alone know how to colonise. Others may begin; we consummate. Others lay the foundations; we alone succeed. The history of the colonial experiments of European nations may almost be summed up in Sir John Eliot's words—"Though many hands are exercised, and divers have their gleanings, the harvest and great gathering comes to one." There are some who are ready to back the opinion—for it is cheap to lay wagers with futurity—that the ultimate destiny of Africa is to fall within the range of British influence. In America and Australia our work is almost done. In Asia it seems likely that it has at present touched its limits. Only in Africa is a field still vacant for English adventure. It is all very well to set limits to our Empire, but nothing can limit the expansion of those forces out of which Empires grow. We may not retain our vast dependencies for ever—though that is no reason why we should not try—but at the worst, if one by one they are to cut themselves adrift, it is no ignoble use of sovereignty to civilise continents, and then to set them free.

We fear we may incur the charge of Jingoism. But, after all, English folks as well as German may be Jingo in ideals, and in treating of African policy it is appropriate for the imagination to rove on a large scale. For the present, however, it is more important to consider what we ought to do. If we are to realise these aims, we must act with promptness. We must prove that we are as much alive to our interests in East Africa as the Germans are to theirs. We must define clearly the limits within which each Power is to act. We must persuade the Government that public opinion will vigorously support them if they vigorously support us. We must find the means to open up by railways and steamers, as Mr. Stanley suggests, free transit from Mombasa to the Lakes and to the Nile, and thence down into that lotus-land of Egypt, which our troops and administrators vainly endeavour to leave. After that we may perhaps begin to think how Cairo can be brought into communication with Cape Town. Above all, we must create for Mr. Stanley a position which will enable him to employ for public uses the powers which he has so conspicuously shown, and to build up another English Empire in the heart of the great continent for which he has taught us to care.

#### MY POSITION ON THE EIGHT HOURS QUESTION.

IN consequence probably of the almost unanimous denunciation of myself from the several platforms at the recent Hyde Park Labour Demonstration, I am permitted to state (so far as the exigencies of space permit) my exact

position on this important phase of the labour agitation. I am, and always have been, in favour of shortening the hours of labour in every industry to the lowest possible daily period consistent with the profitable exploitation of each such industry. I have always maintained that leisure, in excess of mere rest and nourishment period, is necessary for the physical and mental well-being of the worker. I am not satisfied that the same number of hours per day would be a satisfactory limit in the case of all industries, or even, under varying conditions, in similar industries. I hold that the hours of labour can be best arranged in each industry by conference and agreement between the representatives of organised labour on the one hand, and the employers of labour on the other. The movement so numerous demonstrated for in Hyde Park is called "the eight hours movement," but there is not, so far as I am aware, any clear and generally accepted definition of what this phrase covers. Some claim that there should be only eight hours per day worked in any industry; others, that no individual should work more than eight hours, but that, with separate shifts, the establishment may be carried on for any longer period; others, again, that eight hours shall be declared a legal day, but that agreements may be permitted between workers and employers for longer hours, to be specially paid for as overtime. Some would even enforce the eight hours limit against those working in their own homes; others would not. All these conflicting views were represented in the Park on May 4th, with the additional expression of a more extreme section, who state that they are only using the hours of labour cry as a means of attracting working men to their ranks, but that their real aims extend to social revolution. The red flags, carried by certain societies, are pointed to as evidence of this. The demonstrators were still further divided into two great parties:—Those content to enforce one set of hours of labour for all, by means of their great trades' organisations, all acting together; the other claiming the intervention of Parliament, and asking that the hours of labour may be fixed by law. The comparative small interest at present taken in this movement by the great Trades' Unions of the United Kingdom is shown by the fact that, though the question has, I think, on two occasions been submitted to a vote of the general trades, a large majority of the unions did not vote, and those voting were so much divided, that the only thing certain was, the very natural conclusion that all men desire to work fewer hours—especially if they can manage in such lesser hours to subsist themselves, and fairly to keep those dependent on their labour. These men have indeed my good wishes in their efforts.

To the proposal of legal compulsion I offer the most strenuous opposition. I hold that, in reference to adults, Parliament ought not—except for the purpose of preventing crime or preventing injury to life or health—to legislate on any matters on which the people are, or reasonably ought to be, able to protect themselves. I maintain that, in respect to purely self-regarding matters, Parliament ought not to be asked to enact what people shall or shall not do. It is alleged by some of the supporters of the undefined compulsory eight hours day that there are now very many unemployed, and that the effect of limiting the employment in all occupations would be at once to give extra facilities for employing those who at present are in enforced idleness. It may be observed on this, that unless double or treble shifts are permitted, increased hands would, in most cases, also mean increased plant and enlarged buildings; and that, unless these were accompanied with increased products, it would mean largely increased cost of production. It is said that shortened hours of labour are not inconsistent with increased production, for that in many industries the less fatigued worker is capable of a higher effort during the shorter number of hours. My answer to that is, well and good; where the shortened labourer period is certainly beneficial to the men, and not unfairly injurious to the employer, it ought to be obtained, without serious difficulty, by mutual agreement. But, it is



retorted, some bad employers and many needy workmen not belonging to unions will not take part in the mutual agreement, and the law is needed to coerce these. I rejoice that employers and men alike look to profit and comfort, and if it be shown that they can make as much profit and wage in the lesser hours, they will need no coercing. If the coercing is to mean less total earnings to the labourer coerced, it is indefensible. Another observation is that the largest number of the most frequently unemployed will be found in unskilled, casual, and poorly-paid labour; and that the reducing the hours worked all round in the especially skilled and higher branches of industry would not provide employment for these unskilled unemployed, though it might attract to such industries skilled workers from other countries. It is claimed that the shortening the hours of labour would not decrease wage; if it did not so reduce wage, then it must admittedly increase the cost of production, unless corresponding increase of products resulted. No evidence is presented of any such probable, or even possible, increase of production in all industries, or not even in the main industries, on which the great export of this country is dependent.

It is clear that some, at least, of the advocates of a compulsory eight hours do not think that the same production can be effected in the lesser number of hours, for one prominent advocate argues that—"It would diminish competition for employment, because in order to keep up the present production the greater part, if not the whole, of the unemployed would be pressed into work." If the wage of the present workers is not reduced with the hours of working, then it is clear, on this argument, that the cost of production will be materially increased in all industries. Lord Randolph Churchill, speaking, I hope with knowledge, declared in the House of Commons that there is at present a sufficiently large margin of profit made by the capitalists to cover this without increasing the cost of the article to the foreign consumer. Lord Randolph Churchill's declaration had, however, only the weight properly attaching to all his utterances, and would require a very careful examination and verification with respect to each of our great industries before it could be accepted as conclusive. In applying a hard and fast line, it should be borne in mind that there are some industries which are season industries, and in which there is more pressure of employment during stated months of the year, and very little work during the remaining months. How are these to be dealt with under a fixed eight hours for all workers?

If it is proposed that the compulsory limitation of the hours of labour shall be enforced against men and women working in their own homes, I venture to believe that the creation of this new offence, and the use of the police to carry out the new penal enactments, would provoke such resistance as would render the law nugatory.

Much was made in the House of Commons of the eight hours day which has prevailed for some years in Australia, but there it has been obtained by the organised trades, without legislation. The labouring population is limited; assisted immigration of poor workers is discouraged; protective duties are enforced, there being little or no export of manufactured goods, and the high prices of all manufactured products sorely reduces the purchasing power of the nominal wage received. It is also very clear that the eight hours day has not prevented meetings of the unemployed; nor has it prevented demands being made upon the respective Colonial Governments to establish relief works. It is well to note that the Bill which was introduced into the Victorian Assembly to legalise the Australian custom, actually proposed to enact that, either more than an eight hours day, or overtime, might be worked, if agreed to between employer and employed, and that in New South Wales, where the eight hours day is established by custom, overtime is allowed and paid for, and, in many cases, workmen are paid by the hour and not by the day.

CHARLES BRADLAUGH.

## TRAVEL TALKS.

### III.—KAIRWAN.

AT Tunis and at Susa we see Saracen towns which have grown up on Punic and Roman sites, and which have been largely built out of the spoils, if not of Punic, yet of Roman buildings. At Kairwan we come to a Saracen town which is, if anything, yet more thoroughly built out of such spoils than either of the others, but which did not arise on any Punic or Roman site. The city therefore witnesses not only to a large amount of both destructive and constructive energy on the part of its founders, but to a large amount of zeal laid out in bringing this from distant places. One of the most wonderful sights in the world is the quarry at Campobello, where the columns of the fallen temples of Selinus were hewn, and whence the drums were brought, with no small exercise of mechanical powers, to the place where they were to be set up. The quarry for the Saracen buildings of Kairwan was the Roman towns of Africa. The columns to be used up again were not of the same bulk as the "pillars of the giants," but they had to be brought whole, and not in separate drums, and they had to be brought in far greater numbers. The desert, thick with camels or with bullock-carts bearing marble columns, great and small, from the cities that were overthrown to the city that was rising, must have been a wonderful sight. That there was energy and enterprise enough on the part of the combined destroyers and creators to carry columns off to set up again, whether done by Charles the Great or by Okba-ibn-Nafa, shows at least a different state of mind from pounding them into lime. The building of a perfectly new town has been a common fancy among conquerors; but among civilised conquerors one can commonly see some reason for the site chosen. To the Western eye, used to the hill-city, to the river-city, to the city close on the sea or in the sea, Kairwan seems, so to speak, to have been built nowhere in particular. Perhaps the same might be said of a good many English towns, among them some that have risen to great wealth and importance. But the origin of such towns has most likely to be sought in the accident by which some settlement of tillers of the earth grew into the market town, the borough, the city, while its neighbours never got beyond the estate of villages. Many a Roman town sprang out of a camp; but the camp grew into a town only when there was some reason why it should. Here at Kairwan the city grows out of a camp, or rather the camp is pitched with the express purpose of its growing into a city. In 678, thirty-one years after the conquest of Africa had begun, Okba plants his lance, pronounces that "*Hic manebimus optime*," and Kairwan begins its being. The wild beasts and serpents that occupied the site had to be driven away by miracles like those of St. Patrick and St. David. The great public buildings, the mosque and the Kasba, are traced out; the city, purely Mussulman from its birth, is counted as holier than any other Mussulman city, after the birth-place and the burial-place of the Prophet. By a strange turning-about of things, while non-Mussulmans are strictly forbidden to enter the less venerable mosques of Tunis and Susa, those of Kairwan may be freely seen by an order, not from any sacred dignity of Islam, but from the French consul at Susa. It seems that, as the gates of Kairwan were opened to the French, some of the invaders got into the mosques. The tread of the infidels so thoroughly defiled them that there has been no objection to other infidels following in their steps.

It is this permission to see what elsewhere cannot be seen which gives the special attraction to a visit to Kairwan. It has some drawbacks. The journey from Tunis by railway, boat, steamer, boat, tram, is a little complicated, and therefore wearisome. The open tram with curtains is not the conveyance that one would choose for a journey of four hours, specially when one has found out that the sun does not always shine and that the rain does sometimes fall, in Africa itself. But these various ways of going are most likely better than a drive of two days from Tunis along the road. And the French steamers that take you from